

Romans VII and the Doctrine of Perseverance

By

Christopher J. Burchill

‘Es ist der italienische Flüchtling Hieronymus Zanchi, den der reformierte Orthodoxie die erste und grundlegende Fassung des Dogmas de perseverantia sanctorum in fide verdankt und in dessen Streit mit Johann Marbach in Straßburg der unerwartete und bleibende Dissensus zwischen Calvinismus und Luthertum in dieser Frage zutage trat’: in these words the Tübingen theologian Jurgen Moltmann briefly outlined the significance of the bitter controversy that was to prove a crucial turning point in the history of the Strasbourg church in the years following the departure of Bucer and which eventually led to the adoption within the city of the doctrinal standards laid down in the Formula of Concord. In distinction to many of the earlier commentators, such as G.C. Berkhouer, whose work on *Geloof en Volharding* is probably rather better known in the English translation, Moltmann recognized that the difference between the two men over the related issues of predestination and perseverance had deep-reaching implications for the subsequent development of evangelical theology. Even in the context of a shared understanding of ‘sola gratia’, which was clearly the common platform defended by the reformers against the semi-pelagianism of their catholic opponents, this row over perseverance tends to suggest important differences between the two wings of the evangelical movement in the area of theological anthropology. Granted that man was the object rather than the subject of theological discourse--for all that that is in itself a somewhat anachronistic way of presenting the problem--that can in no sense diminish the importance of human psychology in determining the parameters within which this soteriological process came to be outlined.

It is for this reason that an examination of the respective interpretations of Romans 7, that section of the Pauline Epistle where the problems associated with the reception of grace were most clearly

presented, should prove illuminating. It is unfortunate that neither of the main protagonists left detailed commentaries on Romans on the basis of which a thorough evaluation on their respective claims could have been made: the transcription of Marbach's mainly exegetical lecture course of 1558 eventually fell victim to the destruction of the great library in 1870, while it should be noted that Zanchi only turned to comment on the Pauline corpus in the latter stages of his career when mainly concerned with refuting the Christological basis for the doctrine of ubiquity. The situation is further complicated by the fact that despite the protracted nature of the dispute, the two parties were never allowed to meet in the context of a formal debate. Since the discussion was largely confined to the presentation of written submissions either before the Chapter of St. Thomas or to representatives of the civil authority, so it was inevitable that many of the criticisms advanced against the reformed teaching were little more than calumny. Even so, it is clear that the interpretation of the latter part of Romans 7 was to provide the lynch-pin of Zanchi's defense of the doctrine of perseverance. In seeking to refute his claims for the indefectibility of grace within the elect, the Lutheran pastors were forced to take issue at this point and develop their own interpretation of the passage in question. It is the purpose of this present paper to try and clarify these differences through reference to a series of contemporary texts. Only then should it be possible to come to an assessment of the real issues which were dividing the two parties.

I: The most obvious point of departure is with the series of fourteen theses drawn up by Zanchi in March 1561 as a summary of his teaching on the disputed issues of predestination and perseverance. These have already been the subject of considerable analysis, most recently by Wilhelm Neuser in the *Handbuch der Dogmen- und Theologiegeschichte*. Here it is pointed out that the claims in thesis no. 9 that the elect possessed a knowledge and sense of true faith represented a clear departure from the teaching of Calvin. Such differences notwithstanding, the main drift of these four theses was to establish that as a gift received by grace alone, so true faith must have the quality of indefectibility. To suggest that those who were truly regenerate could ever lose their faith would be to overturn the promises of God and question the redemptive force of the life and work of Christ. Despite some of the points that were subsequently to

be made against his teaching, it is important to note that Zanchi saw the grounds of assurance in the will of God as revealed in the New Testament. While this was implicitly to deny any disparity between the revealed and the hidden will of God, it is certainly not fair to suggest that the object of faith is here presented as 'Deus absconditus'.

Even so, the teaching on the indefectibility of divine grace, which was itself to imply the doctrine of perseverance, did pose a number of problems in recounting the existential condition of the believer. Since the state of grace was wholly dependent on the indwelling of Christ through the Spirit, the question was posed as to how this could be reconciled with daily reality of sin. Zanchi had certainly no intention of suggesting a perfectionist view of the Church and fully recognized the need for repentance as an integral feature of the Christian life. It was at this point that the Pauline dialectic of the internal and external natures of man was seen to provide a solution. If the much disputed passage of Romans 7 was taken to refer to those already justified through faith, a point universally accepted by the evangelical party, then the problem could easily be resolved by ascribing the action of sin to the still unregenerate external nature of man. That Paul openly spoke of a conflict within the will only served to confirm that the elect had an enduring sense of the impropriety of sin, a sense which was itself testimony to the continuing presence of the 'semen fidei'. The final thesis which is here cited regarding the action of Peter in denying any association with Christ followed naturally from the above analysis. While such a flagrant betrayal of his Lord did not cease to be described as sin, it yet bore no causal relation to the state of grace.

II: Zanchi's fullest discussion of these problems is to be found in his long *Confessio de Perseverantia Sanctorum in Fide*, which was presented to the Magistrate at the end of October 1562. Here he sought to marshal as much evidence as possible from the work of the reformers in support of his claims. Aside from a number of passages from Luther, Melancthon and Brenz, some of which it must be said were taken out of context, the major authority was clearly that of Bucer, whose commentary on Romans had just been republished in Basel at the instigation of Zanchi's friends. The obvious point of reference was to the long 'quaestio' dealing with the problem of how it was possible for the regenerate to sin without the

full consent of their will. The ensuing account of the two-fold will of man was clearly taken from this source, as was the explanatory reference to Ethics VII, where Aristotle discussed the sense in which a merchant could be said willingly to jettison his cargo in order to save his ship caught in a storm. Although Bucer had not used this passage as a justification for the doctrine of perseverance, the interpretation of Paul was fully in accord with the position advanced by Zanchi. Nor was it difficult for the Italian to find numerous other passages from the work of the Strasbourg reformer in support of his claims.

It is not my purpose to discuss Bucer's commentary at any great length, a subject which I gather has already been handled by those more expert in the subject at an earlier meeting of this seminar. There are, however, two points which I believe should perhaps be mentioned. While much of Zanchi's analysis was common to all of the reformers, a clear difference from the subsequent Lutheran tradition was evident in the insistence that the Apostle was here referring to actual sins committed by those in a state of grace rather than the abiding disposition to sin which was understood by the term concupiscence. This was a necessary qualification in order to safeguard the reference of the passage to the central problem of perseverance; it is a point to which we will return. At the same time both Bucer and Musculus had sought to order their discussion of the three stages of the Christian life as to allow full weight to the process of sanctification. That Zanchi had a similar objective in mind is evident from his use of the concept of the 'semen pietatis', which both served to preserve the elect even before the time of regeneration and to promote the daily struggle for improvement. Certainly it was Zanchi's strong conviction that his theses were no more than a restatement of the tradition established through the work of Bucer.

III: The Italian had already won considerable backing for this claim during the course of two journeys undertaken in the latter part of 1561. The purpose of these trips, which took him first to the academies of Marburg and Heidelberg and then later on a visit to Stuttgart, Tübingen, Schaffhausen, Winterthur, Zurich and Basel, was to demonstrate a general consensus within the evangelical camp in favor of the position outlined in his theses and judging by the letters of support then sent to the Rector Johann Sturm this purpose was largely fulfilled. The most detailed response to his theses on the

nature of faith was that supplied by the theologians of Marburg, where Andreas Hyperius was still the dominant influence. Here the resolution of the problem of the conflict outlined in Romans 7 was presented in terms which simply mirrored the analysis already supplied by Zanchi himself. A certain poignancy was added to the letter by the concluding remark that they were saddened to note that controversy could arise over points of doctrine which Bucer himself 'non minus sinceriter quam perspicue traditit'. Indeed only one voice was raised in dissent. Having agreed to meet Zanchi at the behest of Sturm, Johann Brenz was angered to note that his own authority was being cited in support of the reformed party. It was in order to clarify the situation that a short explanatory letter was sent to Marbach at the beginning of February 1562. Pointing out that he had only been prepared to approve the theses subject to considerable reservations, he went on to add 'In propositionibus de fide insanit cum ait: Electos non posse excidere a fide & amittere Spiritum Sanctum ... ac manifeste significat, se septimum capitulum Pauli ad Romanos non intelligere'. This support from Brenz, which was subsequently developed through personal discussion between the two men at a meeting at Wildbad, was to be of considerable importance in helping Marbach to clarify the grounds of his dissent from the reformed position.

IV: In turning to consider the Lutheran response a couple of problems are immediately apparent. Despite the efforts of Johann Pappus at the time of the row over the *Formula of Concord*, neither of the two principal statements drawn up by members of the *Kirchenkonvent* was ever published. Although these documents have been preserved in the Archives du Chapitre de St. Thomas, it is yet likely that certain aspects would have been revised had the work been intended for wider circulation. As it stands both pieces were clearly written in order to discredit Zanchi as much by association as through a considered refutation of his claims. Nor should it be forgotten that Marbach was by no means solely responsible for the presentation of the Lutheran case, both statements of which were issued in the name of the *Kirchenkonvent* as a whole. It was a point well made by the reformed party that there were evident contradictions contained in the work of their opponents. What is particularly interesting about their discussion of Romans 7 was the way in which it was quite clearly determined by the need to undermine the apparent support this provided for the teaching on perseverance.

The first of these documents, which has only been preserved in the form of a much later transcription in the hand of Johann Faber, was a lengthy refutation of the fourteen theses drawn up in close consultation with Melchior Specker during the summer of 1561. Building on the basis of Marbach's earlier lectures on 1 Corinthians 10, where he had explicitly rejected the idea of unconditional perseverance, the pastors here insisted that even the elect were liable to damnation if they willingly submitted to the dominance of sin. While it was not intended to deny the doctrine of election, this position was clearly difficult to reconcile with the teaching of Augustine, not to mention that of the early reformers. Yet it was frequently emphasized that their determination was to preserve a common-sense view of theology, one suitable for proclamation from the pulpit. For this reason it was important to stress that the grounds of assurance lay in the constant recourse to the external ministry of word and sacrament. The reformed teaching was seen to undermine the function of the call to repentance or the Bußpredigt in treating sin itself within the context of the doctrine of election. As far as the pastors were concerned this could only lead to conclusions similar to those of Caspar Schwenckfeld.

The underlying problem of perseverance was considered in the context of replying to Zanchi's eleventh thesis on the two-fold nature of man. Here it was emphasized that the carnal nature remained a potent force even in the regenerate, one capable of severing the bonds of grace and dispelling the presence of Christ. The exegesis of Romans 7 was then presented 'ut omnes intelligant, ad istud suum pestiferum dogma defendendum, nihil ei prorsus relictum esse defensionis'. Here the pastors followed closely the teaching of Melanchthon, which in other respects provided the basis for Marbach's own views on the problems of predestination and perseverance. While it was thus agreed that Paul was referring to the condition of the Christian in a state of grace, Zanchi and the reformed party were held to have committed three errors of reasoning in their attempt to exploit the distinction between the internal and external natures of man. It was the failure to appreciate the proper sense of the Apostle's teaching that led to the initial confusion between the internal senses and the nature of spiritual man as perceived by God. It was also suggested that Zanchi limited the scope of the Pauline dialectic

through his insistence that ‘totum interiorem hominem esse spiritum et renatum’. This was a logical implication of the reformed position that stood in evident conflict with common sense, according to which the heart (καρδία) was the principal focus for the internal nature of man. Likewise objection was made on grammatical grounds to the central point of Zanchi's argument, namely that the remnant of conscience proved that the elect were never capable of sinning with the full consent of the will. At no point in this analysis was any issue of theological conflict brought to the fore.

V: The major weakness of this early statement by the pastors was that it rested on a flagrant misrepresentation of Zanchi's position, which was quite capable of being reconciled with the points of logic adduced by Marbach. It was for this reason that the pastors came to revise their teaching as the controversy dragged on into the following year. The fruits of consultation with theologians such as Paul Eber in Wittenberg and Jacob Andreae in Tübingen, as well as Johann Brenz, were revealed in the much more sophisticated analysis presented to the Magistrate at the end of June 1562. A summary version of this long apology was drawn up at the same time, an extract of which is here reproduced as representing Marbach's final statement on the question at issue. Here it was emphasized that it was Zanchi's failure to distinguish between mortal and venial sin that lay at the root of the problem. The former consisted in acts that were consciously undertaken against the law of God, which as far as the regenerate were concerned was tantamount to sinning against conscience. It was the necessary conclusion of Zanchi's analysis to deny that any such action was possible, even though this was clearly contradicted by the daily experience of the Church. While it was agreed that the guilt associated with a particular action depended on the state of grace of the one responsible, Marbach was yet determined to prevent this from impinging on the discussion of sin itself, a matter which would inevitably undermine the basis of any moral discourse.

How then was this to be reconciled with the teaching of the Apostle? The pastors now took a rather more balanced view of the text of Romans 7 than had been the case a year before. Stressing the fact that Paul was here speaking of an inner struggle within the hearts of the regenerate, it was pointed out that Zanchi's treatment of the passage simply misunderstood the nature of that struggle. ‘Redet also

der H. Apostel in diesem 7. Capitel nichts von dem sünden wider das gewissen, sonder allein von der anreizung und bösen neigung unseren verderbten natur des alten Adams'. This was a more effective manner of cutting the ground from under Zanchi's feet, since the basis of the reformed case had been to claim that Paul had thus attributed actual sins committed against conscience to the external nature of man. Once this was denied by insisting that the Apostle was here speaking of the disposition towards sin or concupiscence, then any support for the teaching on perseverance was likewise undermined. The fact that this was to depart from the teaching of Bucer was a point which may not have passed their attention, yet it was a necessary step in order to provide a proper refutation of the dangerous implications contained within Zanchi's theses.

Conclusions:

What points may thus be made by way of conclusion? First of all I think it important to emphasize that both sides approached the disputed text of Romans 7 from the point of view of dogmatics rather than with the interest of the exegete. Although Zanchi was able to find strong backing for his interpretation in several of the already published commentaries of the reformers, he was the first to perceive the importance of this text as evidence in support of the reformed understanding of perseverance. One consequence of this was certainly a tendency to undervalue or trivialize the abiding problem of sin within the life of the believer. Still if this was in some ways to miss the point of Paul's exhortation to the Church, it should be noted that in a much fuller discussion of this text prepared more than fifteen years later in Heidelberg, Zanchi came to qualify these points to the extent of recognizing that the power of concupiscence was such that even the regenerate could succumb to the dominance of sin. This was not, however, to qualify his earlier insistence that the elect, those sustained by the 'semen fidei', could never sin with the full consent of the will and it was in this sense that the Pauline teaching came to be read within the context of reformed orthodoxy.

That Marbach's criticism had little to do with a sustained exegesis of the relevant passage, but resulted rather from the simple conviction that Zanchi's views threatened to undermine the work of

the preaching ministry, is even more apparent from his struggle to find a theologically balanced reply. This is not to say that the dogmatic issue was less important, but merely that it was derivative from a sense of engagement in the day to day life of the church. In the end Marbach came to share with Brenz a much deeper understanding of the ineradicable nature of sin. Within human society the regenerate were certainly expected to lead an upright and holy life, yet this in no way altered the fact that even the most pious of works served to their condemnation in the presence of God. Indeed the point was to be made in the latter's commentary on Romans, which was first published the year after the settlement of the controversy in 1564, that even the martyrdom of Peter was as much a demonstration of the incapacity of fallen man to fulfill the spirit of the law as was his earlier betrayal of Christ. Granted that the Lutheran reply to the reformed teaching on perseverance was not finally sorted out until the time of Gerhard, it was clearly realized from the outset that any solution to the problem must pay due respect to the situation of the believer as 'simul iustus et peccator'.

Still it should not be supposed that the differences between the two men can simply be explained at the level of anthropology. Despite their apparent conflict over the relation between the internal and external natures of man, Zanchi never supposed that these terms had any direct ontological bearing and was fully aware that a phrase such as the Old Adam referred equally to 'totus homo, quatenus nondum renatus est in Christo'. Moreover, even if the guilt ascribed to concupiscence was remitted through faith, that little altered the fact that it remained as an indwelling presence throughout the Christian life. At this level the conflict was rather one of presentation, of finding the right formula adequately to convey the existential dimension of the evangelical theology. As these perceptions were then developed through the systematic evaluation of Scripture, so this grounding dimension came to be obscured. The row over perseverance reflected a real and deep division within the Church, but one whose basis was to be found in applied theology--pragmatomachia--rather than in terms of an irreconcilable conflict over first principles.

Documents:

1: Theses D. Zanchii de Fide, O.T. VII/1, 64.

IX: Electis in hoc seculo semel tantum vera fides a Deo datur. Et qui ei donatus est, proesertim de adultis loquor, eam in se ipso sentit, id est certe cognoscit, et sentit, se vere credere.

X: Electi semel vera fide donati, Christoque per Spiritum sanctum vere insiti, fidem prorsus amittere, Spiritum sanctum omnino excutere et a Christo excidere penitus non possunt: idque tum propter promissionum Dei: tum propter Christi precessionem. Neque tamen hinc sequitur, vel poenitentiam negari, vel licentiam concedi.

XI: In electis regeneratis, duo sunt homines, interior et exterior. Ii cum peccant, secundum tantum hominem exteriorem, id est, ea tantum parte, qua non sunt regeniti, peccant: secundum vero interiorem hominem, nolunt peccatum, detestantur peccatum, et condelectantur lege Dei. Quare non toto animo aut plena voluntate peccant.

XII: Petrum, cum negavit Christum, defecit quidem fidei confessio in ore, sed non defecit fides in corde.

2: Quaestio 2: De modo, quo Sancti volentes peccant, O.T. VII/1, 362-3.

Si sancti, cum volentes peccant, tota & plena voluntate, totoque corde peccant, nulla igitur sui parte peccatum odio habent aut detestantur, & nolunt. Hoc autem falsissimum est, & pugnat cum sacris literis.

Rom. 7. Apostolus de Sanctis & renatis omnibus, in sui persona repraesentatis, sic ait: Lex spiritualis est, ego carnalis sum, nempe quod ad hominem exteriorem, utcumque sub peccato, hoc est sub tyrannide emptoris sui. Huiusmodi autem servi non amant tyrannos suos, neque illis ex animo serviunt. Cupiunt enim perpetuo libertatem. Docet igitur, sanctos perpetuo odisse peccatum, proinde cum peccant, non peccare plena voluntate seu ex animo. Hoc melius explicat, cum subdit: Quod enim ago, scilicet peccatum, non probro: hoc est, neque

mente laudo, neque voluntate interioris hominis amo, utrumque enim simul significat Apostolus verbo *yivwokEiv*. Sequitur Apostolos, 'Non enim quod volo, hoc facio, sed quod odi, hoc ago: h.e. quod volo voluntate spiritus, hoc ego ut carnalis non facio, nempe bonum, sed quod odi spiritu, hoc ago ut carnalis, nempe malum. Docet igitur, in renatis, quatenus renati sunt, semper inesse odium peccati, tametsi quatenus carnales sunt, subinde admittant peccata, id quod paulo post repetit, dicens: 'Non enim quod volo ... etc.'

Quod autem multis docuerat, postea concludit in fine capitis, dicens; 'Itaque idem ego mente quidem servio legi Dei, carne autem legi peccati', Apostolum hic loqui de renatis, fatentur omnes docti. Non loqui autem tantum de moribus concupiscentiae, sed etiam de peccatis actualibus, quae Sancti interdum admittunt. Sic etiam Bucerus scribit in eum locum. Tacere, inquit quidam in hic pro concupiscere accipiunt. Sed sic non loquitur Paulus, factum ipsum intelligit, quod impulsu concupiscentiae fit, contra id quod mens dictat, & mens lege consentiens approbat.' Si igitur sancti, in peccatis etiam actualibus, agunt quatenus carnales, quod nolunt, sed oderunt, quatenus spiritualis & renati: manifestum, Sanctos numquam peccare plena voluntate, seu pleno consensu.

3: Iudicium Academim Marburgensis, 15.VIII.1561, O.T. VII/1.

Sic deinde Apostolus Rom. 7 disserit, ut clare demonstret, unum eundemque electum perpetuo duos homines, internum inquam & externum, in se circumferre: neque unum absque altero posse dimoveri. Id vero si datur, operis pretium est statuamus, quamdiu adest homo internus, tamdiu etiam adesse Spiritum Sanctum utpote sine quo internus homo subsistere nequeat.

At si potueris Spiritum aliquando tolli: eadem opera largiaris oportet, etiam luctam illam Spiritus cum carne in hac vita tolli: imo aliquando, absente Spiritu, carnem posse statim in toto homine electo dominari: qua occasione etiam peccata regnantia locum in eodem habebunt. Quo quid absurdius dici queat: Ita. praeterea ibidem depingit Apostolus hominis interni & externi actiones, ut quamvis contrarium sint, tamen esse coniunctae, & eodem tempore simul exerceri videantur. Non quod volo, (inquit) hoc facio: sed quod odi, hoc ago. Iterum: Non quod volo facio bonum. sed quod non volo

malum, hoc ago. Delectat me lex Dei secundum internum hominem: sed video aliam legem in membris meis, rebellantem legi mentis meae, & captivum reddentem me legi peccati quae est in membris meis. Et item: Ego mente quidem servio legi Dei, carne vero legi peccati. Quae omnia perinde sonant, atque si diceret, Apostolus: Quo tempore ipse impulsu carnis & externi hominis male facio, eodem etiam Spiritus Sanctus interiori homini adhuc adsistit, & legem Dei approbat: veruntamen propter modestias & insultationes carnis contristatur, suasque vires non ita, uti alias, exserit.

4: Refutatio thesium Zanchii, 5.VIII.1561, A.S.T. 206, 224—227.

Sed iam ad ea loca, quibus utitur, brevibus respondebimus, ut omnes intelligant ad istud suum pestiferum dogma defendendum, nihil ei prorsus relictum esse defensionis.

Rom. 7 conqueritur Apostolus gravissimis verbis. Delectat me lex Dei secundum internum hominem, sed video aliam legem in membris meis rebellantem legi mentis meae, et captivum reddentem me legi peccati, quae est in membris meis, Et paulo post. Itaque ego, quidem servio mente legi Dei, carne vero legi Peccati.

Ex his verbis Zanchus suam distinctionem probare nititur, sed longe alia est horum verborum sententia, id quod patrum et praeceptorum nostrorum autoritate prolixè demonstrare posset, sed brevitas causa Philippi Melanthonis proceptoris nostri explicationem adferentur, ex qua satis, quomodo sit Apostoli sententia, perspici potest. Verba eius haec sunt: Intelligatur hoc narratio de renatis, et sciamus monachorum interpretationem esse falsam et reiiciendam, qui dixerunt, Paulum hoc loco de homine nondum converso loqui.

Id falsum esse ostenditur ex ipso textu qui dicit, delector lege Dei secundum interiorem hominem, At hoc nondum renatus non delectatur lege Dei. Nominat autem Paulus interiorem hominem, quatenus homo renatus est, videlicet, quatenus lucent in mente, voluntate et corde initia fidei, et per spiritum sanctum accensi sunt motus isti, Timor Dei, dilectio, letitia in Deo, sed adhuc magna caligo et dubitationes reliquae sunt, et corda non sic ardent dilectione et laetitia in Deo, gratitudine erga eum et patientia sicut debent, et haec mala sunt peccata, id est, mala pugnantia cum lege Dei, propter

quam homo dignum esset poenis a8ternis, si non remitterentur propter mediatorem credenti.

Addit autem Paulus splendidum avriBEoiv illustratum figuris a militia sumptis. inveno aliam legem in membris meis militantem contra legem mentis meae, et capientem me captivum legi peccati, quae est in membris meis. Vocabulo LEGIS generaliter hic intelligitur gubernatio, quasi dicat, aliud est gubernans interiorem hominem, scilicet verbum et spiritus sanctus, aliud est gubernans carnalem naturam, scilicet c&c& dubitationes et impetus conversi a Deo, errantes flamm& cupiditatum, impatientia in cruce, hwc mala, inquit, aunt in membris meis, et non aunt leves morbi, sed assidua militia impediunt, languefaciunt et accusant me. Paralogismum igitur Zanchus in hoc loco triplicem committit.

Primus est opwvupias. Dominus aperte etiam in non renatis duplicem hominem constituit, internum et externum, ut item Apostolus et propheta I Corinth. 2. Quis novit ea qu& aunt hominis, nisi spiritus hominis qui in eo est. Plura testimonia in re non obscura adducere, non necessarium est. Internus igitur dupliciter intelligitur, vel secundum substantiam naturamque partium, ex quibus homo constitutus est, vel secundum gratiam, ex qua renatus est.

Alter paralogismus est r(j irapa [pul kai anXws. Zanchus simpliciter affirmat, totum interiorem hominem ease spiritum, et renatum, quad ex verbis Apostoli minime probari potest, ut omnes interpretes sentiunt, sed partim ease renatum, partim non ease renatum, cum enim dicit. Video aliam legem in membris meis. Certe car, quad ad hominem interiorem pertinet, ut demonstravimus, excludere non potest, et per consequens nec ea quam cordi attribuuntur,

Tertius paralogismus est ek Tw napoci-riw. Non enim valet argumentum: Conscientia seu interior homo reclamat peccato et damnat suo iudicio peccatum. Ergo cum electi peccatum admittunt, carne tantum peccant, non tota voluntate et toto animo.

Imo eo gravius ipsorum peccatum est, quo magis a propria conscientia et spiritu a. redarguuntur. Si enim illi damnatur quos propria conscientia tantum accusat, Ro. 1. quanta iustius illi damnabuntur, qui etiam spiritum gratiae peccata prohibentem et ab eis

deterrentem contumelia affecerunt. Cur enim non potius spiritui quam carni obediunt. Cur med&am illam ovidianam potius imitantur, quw, ait, Video meliora proboque, quam Dei filium, qui dicit, non mea voluntas, quee nihil mali in se habebat, sed tua, pater, fiat.

5: Schutzschrift der Kirchendiener zu Straßburg, 24.VI.1562, A.S.T.205, 256—9.

Das aber Zanchus zur beweisung diser seiner proposition, anzeuget das cap. an die Römer ist ein gewisse und offentliche anzeigung seiner unwissenheit das er solch capitel nit verstande. Denn obwol darin der h. apostel van den innerlichen und eUsserlichen menschen redet, so hatt es doch damit keine andere meinung denn wie hievor von streit des innerlichen menschen wider die sUnde des ebsserlichen ist gesagt warden.

Denn der apostel redet als ein Newgeborner von seiner eignen person, anderen zum exempel, disputirt er solche vom gesetz, dz wol an im selber und seiner natur halber heilig, recht vnd gutt ist, aber weil es geistlich ist und also von uns menschen geistliche werck erfordert, das ist einen ganzen vollkommen gehorsam beider tafflen, dz wir gott von ganzen herzen, von ganzer seelen und allen unseren vermijgen, lieben, und unsern nechsten als uns selbst. Vir aber fleiglich sind under die sUnde verkaufft, dz ist. mit einer sUndlichen verderbten natur umbgeben und bekleidet sind, so kUnden wir auch nit solchen gehorsam leisten, derenhalben dan dz gesetz sein ampt der gerechtfertigung an uns verlieret, und an dessen stat uns anklaget die sUnde offenbaret und. krafftig machet, verdambt und. t6det. Demnach klagt er uber den erbarmklichen ellenden stamm, so die Newgebornen hie auf erden fijr und. fijr fUren mijssen, dz sie stets und on underlaB im widerstrebe mit dem sUndigen alten Adam der inen angeboren ist, ligen mijssen, der ob sie wol nach dem innerlichen geistlichen menschen lust, liebe und gefallen haben,, an gott und seinen h. gebotten, und nichts liebers thun wolten, als inen volkUmlich gnug zu thun, so werden sie doch durch die sUnde, die noch im fleisch ubrig, und inen allenthalben anklebet, dermassen verhindert, dz sie des gutten nit volbringen, dz ist, gantz rein sein, und on luste leben mijgen, weil dann in ihren fleisch nichts guts wonet, und. die sUndliche art ihre tUrke nicht lasset, mit gelijsten wider den innerlichen menschen, so kombts, dz die Newgeborne, nicht dz gutte,

dag sie wöllen thun kunden, das ist, das gesetz erfüllen, sondern thun dz böse das sie nicht wöllen, dz ist, sie befinden und. fielen die böse list, dadurch sie an erfüllung des gesetzes und leistung des vollkommen Gehorsams verhindert werden, wie er dann deshalb beschleußt, er sehe ein ander gesetz in seinen gliedern, das ist, die angeborne verderbung und unreinigkeit, die auch nach der heiligung den Newgebornen anhanget, das da widerstreitet dem gesetz in meinem gemijette, dz ist, solche verderbung, ob sie wol durch Christum in der heiligen tauff vergeben, dag sie nicht mehr verdamblich ist, so ist sie doch nicht mißsig, oder allerding todt und abgethan, so hat und behalt noch ihre art in dem, dz sie dem gesetz des gemüts, dz ist, dem innerlichen menschen sich entgegen und. zu widersetzet, dag sie in der massen belestiget, das er vor im, gleich wie ein gefangner man, dz gijtt dz er will, nit kann noch mag volbringen, darumb spricht der apostel weiter, ich ellender mensch, wer will mich erlösen von dem leibe dises todts'? Todt heiget er hie den iamer und die not in dem streit mit der sünde, dieweil dann solcher streit den Newgebornen das leben in diser zeit bitter und. saur machet denn es umb disen streit nicht ein so schlecht und gering ding ist, wie inen sicherl leuth thremen lassen. So nennt er sich auch einen ellenden menschen, der aller halben angefochten und bekdmet wirdt von der welt mit so mancherlei ergernig, von seinen eignem fleisch mit grossen hafftigen lusten und. bewegungen, vom leidigen teuffel der auch nicht feiret, sonder sich fleisset on aufhören wie er den menschen zum fall bringe.

Aber in solcher nott ist dz der Newgebornen trost, dz sie wissen, wie diser ir feind der alte Adam sambt allen seinen anhang dem teuffel unnd der wilt überwinden, und durch Christum der heiland, im obgesiget ist, darumb sagt: Ich danke gott durch Jesum Christum unsern herren, dem sollen wir stehen bleiben, und. in disem streit nicht darunder ligen, so mug es allein durch Christum geschehen, der den teuffel in uns gefangen neme, und. im obsige.

Redet also der heilig apostel in disem 7 capitel. nichts von den sünden wider das gewissen, sonder allein von der anreizung, und. bösen neigung unserer verderbten natur des alten Adams, der von dem Sathan getriben, sich dem geist gottes in der den Newgebornen entgegen setzt, und. also verhindelet thut, dag sie den vollkommen gehorsam in gesetz erfordert nicht leisten kunden, so ist heirauß nun

offenbar, dz dig gantze capitel Zanchi proposition auch nicht mit einen wort oder syllaba beifall. thut und. bestetiget, sonder alles im widerspill.

6: Brevis Expositio Totius Controversi&, A.S.T. 58/23, 924,, -925-.

IX: In electis regeneratis, duo sunt bomines, inter-lar et exterior. Ii cum peccant, secundum tantum bominem exteriorem, id est, ea tantum parte, qua non sunt regeniti, peccant: secundum vero interiorem bominem, nolunt Peccatum, detestantur peccatum, et condelectantur lege Del. Quare non toto ani-mo aut plena voluntate peccant.

RESPONSIO MARBACHII

In hac thesi Zanchus satis ostendit (quamvis magnus atque egregius Theologus ab omnibus existimari vult) se parum in vera Theologia didicisse: imo ne prima quidem Theologiae initia. atque elementa. satis sibi cognita esse. Ut qui non tantum discernere interiorem hominem ab exteriori nequeat: sed quod multo magis est prorsus ignoret, quid proprie Apostolus et Sacra Scriptura exteriorem aut interiorem hominem vocet. Ninime vero onnum intelliget, qua inter hominem interiorem atque exteriorem pugna concertatioque sit. Qua de causa idem, quid intersit et distet inter peccata, venialia. et mortalia, id est, quid peccata. ea, qua contra conscientiam admittuntur, quibus fides et Spiritus Sanctus amittitur: ab Us distent, qua homi-ni ex ignorantia ac contra voluntatem obrepunt, nullo modo potest certo constituere. Id quod copiose in Apologia nostra. probavimus, quag nobis etiam in hac re testimonio esse poterit. Sed ut aliqua tamen ex ea adducamus, summa in his qua sequuntur consistit. Primum male distinguit interiorem hominem ab exteriori: nec proprie potest explicare, quid sit hono aut interior aut exterior. Nan tametsi illud verum est, renatorum (quamdiu per interiorem hololinen cum exteriori confligunt, eique resistunt) infirmitates et lapsus pro peccatis mortalibus non censi: sed venialia. ac tecta peccata appellari: quod non ex toto corde ac voluntate peccent: tamen cum interiore homini certamine succumbit ac vincitur. Id quod solet accidere cum renati scientes contra legen Dei ac suam conscientiam faciunt: tun peccatum ad mortem committitur. In quo committendo non tantun exterior hono reus sit, sed multo magis interior: eo quod tunc superatus sit, et una

cum eo omnia quaecumque hominis sunt sive interiora, ut anima, cor, voluntas: sive exteriora, ut caro et sanguis, cum omnibus sensibus. Rmc omnis simul victa ac prostrata esse dicimus. Deinde hac thesi necessarium discrimen inter mortalia et venialia. peccata tollitur, quod plurimum refert omnes Christianos; probe tenere qua diligentius sibi ab iis peccatis caveant, quibus fiden & Spiritum Sanctum indignissime a se repellunt: et gratia Dei iustissime excidunt.

Praeterea in hac thesi Zanchus ex Stoicorum sententia omnia peccata paria facit. Nam cum electi et renati nec fidem nec Spiritum Sanctum amittant: adde etiam quod nec toto corde nec tota voluntate peccent, non igitur ipsis mortalia, peccata adscribi poterunt: sed contra omnis eorum peccata tantum ad nomen ac numerum peccatorum venialium testorumque referenda erunt.

Postremo omnium piorum iudicio committimus iisque potestatem facimus, ut cogitent ac statuunt quam prophani securi homines nobis ex hac praestclara Zanchi Theologia brevi nascentur: & quanta fenestra veteri Adamo ad omnem suam explendam libidinem aperiat. Nimirum, si hominibus persuasum erit, primum, renatos non posse designare peccatum ad mortem, etiamsi scientes et volentes mandata Dei transgrediantur. De hinc iam exteriorem in iis tantum hominem peccare id est, solam carnem: non interiorem, id est, cor, animum ac voluntatem. De his rebus (ut dicimus) omnium piorum atque intelligentium iudicia. etiam atque etiam expetimus.

I: Quaestiones de peccato originali in renatis ex Rom. 7, O.T. IV, 62-87.

Q 1: Utrum In renatu post remissionem peccatorum omnium, remaneat adhuc peccatum illud originale. & quomodo fieri possit, si sublatum, est per C. bristum, ut adhuc remaneat?

Peccatum originale in sanctis, cum Christo inseruntur, partim transit, culpa scilicet, reatu, suique extenuatione, partim non transit, sed remanet nempe actu.

Q 2: Si remanet, ubinam remaneat: utrum in carne tantum, b.e. in corpore, an vero etiam in anima? Ac praeinde quibus vitis constet hoc peccatum, etiam in homine renato?

Quod in renato actu remanere peccatum originale, illud tam in totam animam quam in corpus diffusum remanet, eoque vitis non tantum sensitiva vegetivae partis, sed etiam intellectus ac voluntatis innumeris constat.

Q 3: Cum sit diffusum in totum homine, multisque vitis constet, cur a Paulo appellatum, fuerit, tanquam nomine proprio, concupiscentia.

Etsi vero nomen Concupiscentim sua propria significatione, non omnia originalis peccati vitia complectitur: non abs re tamen Apostolus totum hoc malum Concupiscentiam appellavit.

Q 4: Utrum hxc concupiscentia In renatis sit vere & proprie peccatum'?

Concupiscentia in Renatis vere & proprie peccatum est: suapte natura nos mternae morte obnoxios reddens, quamquam propter Christum non imputetur ad mortem.

Q 5: Quae et quanta sit vis huius peccati In ipsis etiam De filiis?

Concupiscentia originali, quae in renatis remanet, tametsi sua natura adhuc vere peccatum est, vim tamen non habet aut condemnandi, aut dominandi, (nisi qui regeneratus est, sese illi sponte dedat, & in servitudinem tradat) idque non sua quidem habet natura, sed propter Christum, qui illius vim, & suo sanguine, ne damnet, impedit, & suo spiritu, ne dominetur, cohibet.

Concupiscentia in renatis, etsi propter Christum nullam habet vim condemnandi, aut dominandi: vim tamen adhuc retinet atque exserit non exiguam: cum contra Spiritum ita fortiter pugnet, ut & perfecta legis obedientia illos impediatur, & ad multo contra legem admittenda impellat,

Q 6: Utrum peccatum hoc In sanctis Inhabitans, pelli prorsus ab eis possit. et si iam non possit, an saltem Ita possit oppugnari, ut vires

eius In dies innuantur. & quibusnam modis atque armis Id fieri queat'?

Dum mortale hoc corpus gestamus: tyrannus iste noster domesticus pelli prorsus e nobis non potest.

Etsi vero, dum sumus in hoc mortali corpore liberari omnino non possumus peccato inhabitante, eius tamen potentia ac vis, ut magna sit, per gratiam Christi nobis communicatam, superari & infirmari a nobis potest, ut in nobis non regnet.

Brentius in Epistolam ad Romanos (1564), Opera VII/1, 613.

Hic iterum admonendi sumus, quod Paulus loquatur de piis & in Christo renatis, non de malis, seu impiis. Nam impii, quia non sunt renati, tanta iniquitate sunt caecati, natura, ut ne velint quidem perfectum bonum. Volunt quidem, humana sua ratione, honestatem externam, & civiles virtutes, non volunt autem perfectum bonum. Ignorent enim quid sit vere ac perfecte bonum.

Quare cum Paulus dicit: Velle adiacet mihi, non loquitur de impiis, aut in poenitentibus, sed loquitur de piis in Christo renatis, aut ad Christum reversis, quorum conditionem in hoc seculo exponit. Deinde non est ita intelligendum, quod loquatur de externis peccatis, cum ait: Ut perficiam bonum, non inveno, videlicet, quod sentiat pios & sanctos homines; non facere externam iustitiam. Qui enim sunt pii, in Christo renati, ducunt honestam vitam, & quanquam relabantur aliquoties & ipsi ex imbecillitate in externa scelera, tamen maxima vitæ parte, faciunt bona & honesta opera. Hoc enim exigit pietas in Deum, & fides in Christum. Sed intelligendum est, quod cum pii & sancti obediunt legi Dei, & faciunt bonum opus, non tamen perficiant hoc opus, (hoc est) non faciunt ipsum perfecte, sine omni vicio. Quodcunque enim opus, quamvis optimum, fecerint, habet tamen in se aliquid vicii, ut non sit perfectum, nec impleat legem Dei.